UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,530	02/23/2004	Ashvin Joseph Mathew	MS#304546.01 (5098)	7752

38779   7590   10/22/2008
SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT)
100 NORTH BROADWAY
17TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

EXAMINER
BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/22/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 June 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/6/08*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1, 18, 19, 21, 23-29, 31-33, and 35-40 are amended. Claims 2, 20, 30 and 34 are

cancelled. Claims 1, 3-19, 21-29, 31-33, and 35-40 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 6/29/2008, with respect to all of the previous

objections and rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous objections

and rejections have been withdrawn. Further search has yielded the Guigui reference which is

now applied as prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 11, 15-19, 21, 23-24, 27, 31-33, 36, and 40 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication Number

2004/0186901 by Guigui.

As to claim 19, Guigui teaches an authentication system comprising: an authentication

server coupled to a data communication network **(paragraph 41, radius server)**; an

authentication database associated with the authentication server **(paragraph 41)**, said

authentication database being configured to store authentication information for comparison to

login information provided by a user for authenticating the user **(paragraph 41)**,, said

authentication database further being configured to store user-specific information identifying

the user with respect to one or more services provided by at least one affiliate server coupled to

the data communication network **(paragraphs 59-62, the servers are affiliate servers)**, said

affiliate server being configured to provide the one or more services to the user via a client

coupled to the data communication network **(paragraphs 59-62, the servers are affiliate**

servers); said authentication server being configured to receive a request from the user for a

service to be provided by the affiliate server, said authentication server further being configured

to authenticate the user responsive to the request when login information retrieved from the user

via the data communication network matches the authentication information stored in the

authentication database **(paragraphs 59-62)**; said authentication server being further configured

to maintain a user profile storing the user-specific information, to receive a request from the

requested service for user information associated with the user and consent to use the requested

user information, to determine if the requested user information is stored in the user profile in

response to the request for consent **(paragraphs 59-62)**; and said authentication server being

further configured to provide a user interface to collect the requested user information that is not

stored in the user profile from the user, to receive the user information provided by the user via

the user interface in response, and to allow access by the requested service to the received user

information **(paragraphs 59-62)**; wherein the authentication server is configured to update the

user profile with the received user information **(paragraph 21)**. As to the remainder of the

limitations of claim 19, Guigui teaches the claimed second affiliate server, as multiple services are disclosed.

As to claim 21, Guigui teaches the system of claim 19, wherein the authentication server is configured to allow, in response to the request for consent, access by the requested service to the requested user information if the user information is stored in the user profile **(paragraphs 59-62)**.

As to claim 23, Guigui teaches the system of claim 19, wherein the user interface provided by the authentication server displays a user-selectable option for viewing intention information associated with the requested user information, said intention information describing how the requested user information will be used by the requested service **(paragraphs 59-62)**.

As to claim 24, Guigui teaches the system of claim 23, wherein the authentication server is configured to provide an intention user interface for displaying the intention information, said intention user interface being provided by the authentication server in response to the user-selectable option being selected by the user **(paragraphs 59-62)**.

As to claim 27, Guigui teaches the system of claim 19, wherein the requested service is granted consent to use the user-specific information stored in the user profile **(paragraphs 59-62)**.

As to claim 31, Guigui teaches the system of claim 19, wherein the authentication server is configured to provide an administrator user interface to a responsible person of the user in response to the received user information, said administrator user interface allowing the

responsible person of the user to grant consent for the requested service to use the received user

information **(paragraphs 59-62)**.

As to claim 32, Guigui teaches the system of claim 31, wherein the authentication server

is configured to allow access by the requested service to the received user information if consent

for the requested service to use the received user information is granted by said responsible

person **(paragraphs 59-62)**.

As to claims 1-3, 5-6, 11-12, and 15-18, they are directed towards the method

implemented by the system of claim 19 and its dependents and are therefore rejected for the

same reasons.

As to claims 33-34, 36, and 40, they are directed towards media that is part of the system

of claim 19 and its dependents and are therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 8-10, 12-14, 22, 26, 28-30, 35, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0186901 by

Guigui in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2002/0023059 by Bari et al (Part of

applicant's IDS).

As to claims 4, 22 and 35, Guigui teaches the system of claim 19, however Guigui does not explicitly teach a system wherein the user interface provided by the authentication server displays the user-specific information previously stored in the user profile.

Bari teaches a system wherein the user interface provided by the authentication server displays the user-specific information previously stored in the user profile (paragraph 44 and Figures 9A-D).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Guigui regarding a user authorization system with the teachings of Bari regarding displaying user specific information previously stored because doing so allows a user to easily change previously entered information.

As to claims 8-10, 26, and 38, Guigui teaches the system of claim 24, however Guigui does not explicitly teach wherein the requested service is a member of a policy group, and wherein said intention user interface further displays a list of members of said policy group.

Bari teaches a system wherein the requested service is a member of a policy group, and wherein said intention user interface further displays a list of members of said policy group (paragraph 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Guigui regarding a user authorization system with the teachings of Bari regarding displaying a list of affiliates because a list allows a user to more easily select who to provide information to.

As to claims 9 and 10, Bari teaches a method wherein said intention user interface further displays a second user-selectable option for viewing a privacy policy associated with said policy group, said privacy policy relating to how user information that the policy group is granted consent to use is to be protected and providing a policy user interface via the browser for displaying the privacy policy, said policy user interface being provided in response to the second user-selectable option being selected by the user (paragraph 44).

As to claims 12-14, 28-30, and 39, Guigui teaches claims 11, 27, and 33 including revoking consent (see paragraphs 46-47); however Guigui does not explicitly teach list services. Bari teaches listing services that a user may want access to (paragraph 43). It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Guigui and Bari for the reasons given in the rejections of claims 8, 26, and 38 above.

Claims 7, 25, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0186901 by Guigui in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0076233 by Aarts et al (Part of applicant's IDS).

As to claims 7, 25, and 37, Guigui teaches the system of claim 24, however Guigui does not explicitly teach wherein said intention user interface further displays retention information associated with the requested user information, said retention information specifying how long the requested user information will be retained by the requested service.

Aarts teaches a system wherein said intention user interface further displays retention information associated with the requested user information, said retention information specifying how long the requested user information will be retained by the requested service (paragraph 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Guigui regarding a user authorization system with the teachings of Aarts regarding retention periods for data because a user may only want to release information for a certain period of time (Aarts, paragraph 30).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442